



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,485	12/08/2003	Raymond C. Kurzweil	13151-006001	2555

26161 7590 01/23/2009  
FISH & RICHARDSON PC  
P.O. BOX 1022  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
----------

GODBOLD, DOUGLAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

01/23/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/730,485	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KURZWEIL, RAYMOND C.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DOUGLAS C. GODBOLD	<b>Art Unit</b> 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to correspondence filed 28 October 2008 in reference to application 10/730,485. Claims 1-31 are pending and have been examined.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

2. The amendment filed October 28, 2008 has been accepted and considered in this office action. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 15-17, 19-21, and 28 have been amended.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed October 28, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. Regarding applicants arguments, see Remarks, pages 1-2, that "a plurality of track transitions made by plural users," has support in the specification, the examiner disagrees. The applicant argues that "nowhere in the specification is 'a user' construed to mean a solitary user." However "a user" is usually used to mean one person, and the specification does not specifically define "a user" to mean multiple users. Therefore "a plurality of track transitions made by plural users," has insufficient support in the specification.

Art Unit: 2626

5. Regarding applicants arguments, see Remarks, pages 2-3, that Bennett does not teach or suggest a "commercial transaction," the examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant argues that Bennett is only directed towards answering question and providing information. However column 8 lines 44-50 teach transactions that are related to commerce. While Bennett does not specifically teach buying and selling of goods, it is noted that the claims do not specifically define a "commercial transaction" as such. Therefore a commercial transaction could fairly be interpreted as a transaction of information related to commerce, such as checking a price or the availability of an item. For at least these reasons, Bennett teaches a "commercial transaction."

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Independent claims 1, 15 and 28 now all contain newly added limitations "analyzing, statistically, a plurality of tracked transactions made by plural users to produce market research information." However the examiner can not find any support

Art Unit: 2626

in the specification for the phrase "a plurality of tracked transactions made by plural users." Only support for histories from "a user" is found on page 8 first paragraph.

Therefore claims 1, 15 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as containing new matter. Claims 2-14, 16-27, and 29-31 further limit claims 1, 15 and 28 and are therefore rejected as well.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

9. **Claims 1-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BENNETT (US Patent 7,050,977) in view of SMITH (US Patent 6,853,982).

10. Regarding **claim 1**, BENNETT teaches a computer implemented method of conducting commerce ("e-commerce applications", column 8, lines 44-45), the method comprising:

receiving a commercial transaction request from a user as text input ("outputs recognized speech text corresponding to the user's question", column 11, lines 14-15, checking prices and availability of items are commercial transaction; column 8 line 45-50);

using natural language processing to analyze the text input to build a conversation with the user based on the commercial transaction request ("natural

Art Unit: 2626

language engine 190 facilitates structuring the query to database 188", column 11, lines 20-22);

conducting a commercial transaction with the user based on the text input ("retrieves an appropriate answer", column 11, line 19);

generating a voice-synthesized response in accordance with the commercial transaction through an avatar ("expressed as oral feedback by animated character agent 157", column 11, lines 25-26);

tracking the commercial transaction by storing the transaction in the database ("noun phrases of the string are stored", column 25, line 7).

BENNETT does not specifically teach analyzing, statistically, a plurality of tracked transactions made by plural users to produce market research information.

In the same field of e-commerce, SMITH teaches analyzing, statistically, a plurality of tracked commercial transactions made by plural users to produce market research information (figure 3A, described column 14 line 44 to column 15 line 8, teaches histories for all users are considered in order to determine similar items and from there generate recommendations, which is in fact market research information. It is inherent that by using histories, statistical analysis is necessary in order to generate recommendations.)

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the market research of SMITH with the system of BENNETT in order to allow for recommendations to be made to a user that are relevant to the current session of the user (SMITH column 1 lines 10-12).

Art Unit: 2626

11. Regarding **claim 2**, BENNETT further teaches that tracking comprises: searching a database to find related information associated with conducting the commercial transaction ("set of potential questions corresponding to the user's query are received as a result of a full-text search", column 25, lines 15-16).

12. Regarding **claim 3**, BENNETT teaches all of the claimed limitations of claim 1.

However BENNETT does not specifically disclose the generation of follow-up messages.

In the same field of e-commerce, SMITH teaches generating follow-up messages to send to the user ("generates a list of additional items that are predicted to be of interest to the user", column 7, lines 30-32) that are based on added information stored in the database (see column 9, lines 37-52, a list of information used to generate the recommendation).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the recommendation system of SMITH with the e-commerce system of BENNETT so that the received messages will be relevant to the current browsing session (see SMITH, column 1, lines 10-12).

13. Regarding **claim 4**, SMITH further teaches that the follow-up messages with the user are statistically analyzed to generate marketing related information ("generates a list of additional items that are predicted to be of interest to the user", column 7, lines 30-32, where presenting items of interest is equivalent to marketing the item).

14. Regarding **claim 5**, BENNETT further teaches that the transaction is a user request as to order status for an order being tracked in the database (see FIG. 18, block 1860, "view your orders").

15. Regarding **claim 6**, BENNETT further teaches that generating the response comprises:

searching a database for content related to the commercial transaction request ("set of potential questions corresponding to the user's query are received as a result of a full- text search", column 25, lines 15-16); and

animating the avatar with a voice and facial movements corresponding to content found in the database ("expressed as oral feedback by animated character agent 157", column 11, lines 25-26).

16. Regarding **claim 7**, BENNETT further teaches that animating comprises generating helpful verbal suggestions for conducting the commercial transaction ("told by character 1440 about how to elicit the information required", column 36, lines 14-15).

17. Regarding **claim 8**, BENNETT further teaches that animating comprises processing text input from the user with natural language processing techniques to develop and build conversations between the user and the avatar ("an environment that



Art Unit: 2626

emulates a normal conversational human-like question and answer dialog", column 36, lines 28-29).

18. Regarding **claim 9**, BENNETT further teaches that receiving the text input is in response to a suggestion generated by the avatar ("told by character 1440 about how to elicit the information required", Column 36, lines 14-15).

19. Regarding **claim 10**, BENNETT further teaches that the program performs an inquiry for financial information related to the user ("account information", FIG. 18, column 37, lines 34-35).

20. Regarding **claim 11**, BENNETT further teaches that the program supports a sales transaction ("ordering", FIG. 18, column 37, line 33).

21. Regarding **claim 12**, BENNETT further teaches that the program supports a help desk inquiry that involves customer support for a product or service ("e-support", column 36, lines 55-67).

22. Regarding **claim 13**, BENNETT further teaches that the program supports a report for customer support to report a malfunctioning product, system, or service ("a 'monitor' problem, a 'keyboard' problem, a 'printer' problem, etc", column 36, lines 64-65).

23. Regarding **claim 14**, BENNETT further teaches that the program calls another program to process an inquiry (see FIG. 5, the query is processed by a number of different modules).

24. Regarding **claim 15**, BENNETT teaches a computer program product ("microcode and software routines", column 38, lines 57-58) residing on a computer readable medium ("suitable machine-readable format", column 38, line 61), for conducting commerce ("e-commerce applications", column 8, lines 44-45) comprises instructions for causing a computer to:

- receive a commercial transaction request from a user as text input ("outputs recognized speech text corresponding to the user's question", column 11, lines 14-15);

- analyze the text input using natural language processing to build conversations with the user based on the transaction request ("natural language engine 190 facilitates structuring the query to database 188", column 11, lines 20-22);

- conducting a commercial transaction with the user based on the text input ("retrieves an appropriate answer", column 11, line 19);

- generate a voice-synthesized response in accordance with the commercial transaction through an avatar ("expressed as oral feedback by animated character agent 157", column 11, lines 25-26);

- track the commercial transaction by storing the transaction in the database ("noun phrases of the string are stored", column 25, line 7).

BENNETT does not specifically teach analyze, statistically, a plurality of tracked commercial transactions made by plural users to produce market research information.

In the same field of e-commerce, SMITH teaches analyze, statistically, a plurality of tracked commercial transactions made by plural users to produce market research information (figure 3A, described column 14 line 44 to column 15 line 8, teaches histories for all users are considered in order to determine similar items and from there generate recommendations, which is in fact market research information. It is inherent that by using histories, statistical analysis is necessary in order to generate recommendations.)

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the market research of SMITH with the system of BENNETT in order to allow for recommendations to be made to a user that are relevant to the current session of the user (SMITH column 1 lines 10-12).

25. Regarding **claim 16**, BENNETT further teaches that the instructions to track comprise instructions to:

search a database for related information associated with conducting the commercial transaction ("set of potential questions corresponding to the user's query are received as a result of a full-text search", column 25, lines 15-16).

26. Regarding **claim 17**, BENNETT teaches all of the claimed limitations of claim 15.

However BENNETT does not specifically disclose the generation of follow-up messages.

In the same field of e-commerce, SMITH teaches generating follow-up messages to send to the user ("generates a list of additional items that are predicted to be of interest to the user", column 7, lines 30-32) that are based on added information stored in the database (see column 9, lines 37-52, a list of information used to generate the recommendation).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the recommendation system of SMITH with the e-commerce system of BENNETT so that the received messages will be relevant to the current browsing session (see SMITH, column 1, lines 10-12).

27. Regarding **claim 18**, SMITH further teaches that responses to the follow-up messages are received ("rate individual book titles", column 10, lines 17-18) and the responses (see column 9, lines 37-52, ratings information is used) are statistically analyzed to generate marketing related information ("generates a list of additional items that are predicted to be of interest to the user", column 7, lines 30-32, where presenting items of interest is equivalent to marketing the item).

28. Regarding **claim 19**, BENNETT further teaches that the commercial transaction is a user request as to order status for an order being tracked in the database (see FIG. 18, block 1860, "view your orders").

Art Unit: 2626

29. Regarding **claim 20**, BENNETT further teaches that the instructions to generate the response comprise instructions to:

search a database for content related to the commercial transaction request ("set of potential questions corresponding to the user's query are received as a result of a full-text search", column 25, lines 15-16); and

animate the avatar with a voice and facial movements corresponding to content found in the database ("expressed as oral feedback by animated character agent 157", column 11, lines 25-26).

30. Regarding **claim 21**, BENNETT further teaches that the instructions to animate comprise instructions to generate verbal suggestions for conducting the commercial transaction ("told by character 1440 about how to elicit the information required", column 36, lines 14-15).

31. Regarding **claim 22**, BENNETT further teaches that the instructions to animate comprise instructions to use natural language processing to develop and build conversations between the user and the avatar ("an environment that emulates a normal conversational human-like question and answer dialog", column 36, lines 28-29).

32. Regarding **claim 23**, BENNETT further teaches that the program performs an inquiry for financial information related to the user ("account information", FIG. 18, column 37, lines 34-35).

33. Regarding **claim 24**, BENNETT further teaches that the program supports a sales transaction ("ordering", FIG. 18, column 37, line 33).

34. Regarding **claim 25**, BENNETT further teaches that the program supports a help desk inquiry that involves customer support for a product or service ("e-support", column 36, lines 55-67).

35. Regarding **claim 26**, BENNETT further teaches that the program supports a report for customer support to report a malfunctioning product, system, or service ("a 'monitor' problem, a 'keyboard' problem, a 'printer' problem, etc", column 36, lines 64-65).

36. Regarding **claim 27**, BENNETT further teaches that the program calls another program to process an inquiry (see FIG. 5, the query is processed by a number of different modules).

37. Regarding **claim 28**, BENNETT teaches a system for conducting commerce, the system comprising: a server computer (see FIG. 1, block 180, "server-side") for receiving a commercial transaction request from a user as text input ("outputs recognized speech text corresponding to the user's question", column 11; lines 14-15);

Art Unit: 2626

analyzing the text input using natural language processing to build conversations with the user based on the transaction request ("natural language engine 190 facilitates structuring the query to database 188", column 11, lines 20-22);

conducting the commercial transaction with the user based on the text input ("retrieves an appropriate answer", column 11, line 19);

generating a voice-synthesized response in accordance with the commercial transaction through an avatar ("expressed as oral feedback by animated character agent 157", column 11, lines 25-26); and

tracking the commercial transaction by storing the transaction in the database ("noun phrases of the string are stored", column 25, line 7).

BENNETT does not specifically teach analyzing, statistically, a plurality of tracked commercial transactions made by plural users to produce market research information.

In the same field of e-commerce, SMITH teaches analyzing, statistically, a plurality of tracked transactions made by plural users to produce market research information (figure 3A, described column 14 line 44 to column 15 line 8, teaches histories for all users are considered in order to determine similar items and from there generate recommendations, which is in fact market research information. It is inherent that by using histories, statistical analysis is necessary in order to generate recommendations.)

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the market research of SMITH with the system of BENNETT in order to allow for recommendations to be made to a user that are relevant to the current session of the user (SMITH column 1 lines 10-12).

38. Regarding **claim 29**, BENNETT further teaches:

a client system (see FIG. 1, block 150, "client-side") for sending the text input to the server ("set of speech vectors that are transmitted over communication channel 160", column 11, lines 8-9), with the client system executing a web browser program ("web page in browser 1200", column 38, line 2).

39. Regarding **claim 30**, BENNETT teaches all of the claimed limitations of claim 28.

However BENNETT does not specifically disclose the generation of follow-up messages.

In the same field of e-commerce, SMITH teaches generating follow-up messages to send to the user ("generates a list of additional items that are predicted to be of interest to the user", column 7, lines 30-32) that are based on added information stored in the database (see column 9, lines 37-52, a list of information used to generate the recommendation).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the recommendation system of SMITH with the e-commerce system of BENNETT so that the received messages will be relevant to the current browsing session (see SMITH, column 1, lines 10-12).



40. Regarding **claim 31**, SMITH further teaches that the server receives responses to the follow-up messages ("rate individual book titles", column 10, lines 17-18) and statistically analyzes the responses (see column 9, lines 37-52, ratings information is used) to generate marketing related information ("generates a list of additional items that are predicted to be of interest to the user", column 7, lines 30-32, where presenting items of interest is equivalent to marketing the item).

### ***Conclusion***

41. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS C. GODBOLD whose telephone number is (571)270-1451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:00am-4:30pm Friday 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DCG

/Patrick N. Edouard/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626